

REMARKS

Claims 1-82 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Office action dated November 21, 2005, claims 1-82 were rejected. Applicants thank Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Claims 1, 18, 21, 26-27, 29-30, 41, 52, 63, 66-82 are amended herein. No claims are cancelled or added. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Applicants reserve the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b) in View of Walker

In the 6th paragraph of the Office action, Examiner rejects claims 1-15, 19-38, 41-49, 52-60, 62-77, and 79-82 under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by EPO Publication No. WO 01/86390 to Walker et al. ("Walker"). The claims have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are patentable over the cited reference, and in condition for allowance.

Claim 21 has been amended to now recite:

"responsive to a pointer being over the structured datum, transmitting additional information from the reference database according to the association, the additional information being simultaneously displayable in an area proximate to the structured datum."

Thus, claim 21 recites transmitting additional information when a viewer of the augmented data file moves the pointer over the structured datum, so that the additional information can be displayed near the structured datum. Support for this amended feature can be found in the specification, for example, from page 7, line 12 to line 17, and Figure 7. This claimed feature is advantageous because the additional information is transmitted and displayed when the pointer moves over the structured datum. The additional information displayed to the viewer is retrieved from another database holding such information. Thus, because the additional information is stored independent of the other data, it allows for the most up-to-date information associated with the structured datum.

Claims 1, 30, 41, 52, and 63 similarly recite the above feature of transmitting additional information to be displayed when the pointer moves over the structured datum.

Walker, among other differences, does not disclose transmitting additional information from a separate database when the pointer moves over the structured datum. Rather, in contrast to the claimed invention, Walker discloses a method to incorporate hyperlinks into electronic files from a preference database based on the content of the files, and present viewers with the files along with the incorporated hyperlinks. (Walker, page 16, lines 10-26). By incorporating the hyperlinks directly into the web page, rather than from a simultaneously accessed separate database, the system in Walker does not transmit additional information when the viewer moves a pointer over a structured datum in an electronic file. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 21, 30, 41, 52, and 63 are patentably distinguishable over Walker.

As to the dependent claims, because claims 2-15, 19-20 are dependent on claim 1, claims 22-29 are dependent on claim 21, claims 31-38 are dependent on claim 30, claims 42-

49 are dependent on claim 41, claim 53-60, 62 are dependent on claim 52, claims 64-77, 79-82 are dependent on claim 63, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 21 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 1-15, 19-20, 22-38, 41-49, 52-60, 62-77, and 79-82.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Walker and Skillen

In the 7th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 16-18, 39-40, 50-51, 61, and 78 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Walker and U.S. Patent No. 6,098,065 to Skillen et al. ("Skillen"). The claims have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are patentable over the cited references, and in condition for allowance.

As stated above, claims 1, 30, 41, 52, and 63 are patentably distinguishable over Walker because they recite the element of transmitting additional information to be displayed near the structured datum when the pointer moves over the structured datum, and Walker, among other differences, does not disclose the claimed transmitting element. Because claims 16-18 are dependent on claim 1, claims 39-40 are dependent on claim 30, claims 50-51 are dependent on claim 41, claim 61 is dependent on claim 52, and claim 78 is dependent on claim 63, they all recite the above cited feature.

Skillen, like Walker, does not disclose the claimed transmitting element. Skillen discloses a method of providing desired information to a user searching for desired information within a data network. The method comprising receiving search request from the user, searching in the data network, and providing the result back to the user. (Skillen, col. 1, lines 37-67, col. 2, lines 1-10). Skillen does not teach or suggest transmitting

additional information to be displayed near the structured datum when the pointer moves over the structured datum.

The combination of Walker and Skillen likewise fails to disclose or suggest the claimed transmitting element. As discussed above, the claimed transmitting element is not disclosed in either reference. Even if the two references arguably could be combined, at best the combination provides a linking mechanism to get access to data at another location (the URL link) within an electronic file, which is conventional and not what Applicants claim.

Thus, alone or in combination, Walker and Skillen do not disclose the claimed transmitting element.

Based on the above Amendment and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons, claims 16-18, 39-40, 50-51, 61, and 78 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-82, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Date:

Jan. 23, 2006

By:

Rajiv Patel

Respectfully Submitted,
Douglas Stevenson and Craig Allen Gooding

Rajiv P. Patel, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,327
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7607
Fax: (650) 938-5200